



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Today taste and fashion have for a season turned away from the imposing tapestries of the literary historian, in favor of the drab serge of research among diplomatic archives, parish registers, private muni-ments, and everything else so long as it is not print. As Acton put it, the great historian now takes his meals in the kitchen. Even here we are not quite at our ease. Bismarck, reading a book of superior calibre, once came upon a portrait of an eminent personage whom he had known well. Such a man as is described here, he cried, never existed. . . . "It is not in diplomatic materials, but in their life of every day that you come to know men." So does a singularly good judge warn us of the perils of archival research. Nor can we forget the lament of the most learned and laborious of all English historians of our time. "I am beginning to think", said Freeman, "that there is not, and never was any such thing as truth in the world" (pp. 90-91).

Lord Morley has stimulating paragraphs on religious history, on the insufficiency of *Culturgeschichte*, on the abuse of historic parallels, and on similarly pertinent matters. He touches also on such fundamental questions as nationality, progress, and the conflicting opinions as to what constitutes the State. He contrasts Cavour's ideal, Liberty, with Bismarck's ideal, Authority. In conclusion, he rejects the view of the sardonic critics of great men and human life. He says:

Without making the mistake of measuring the stature of rulers and leaders of men by the magnitude of transactions in which they found themselves engaged, none at least of those who bear foremost names in the history of nations ever worked and lived, we may be sure, in the idea that it was no better than solemn comedy for which a sovereign demiurgus in the stars had cast their parts" (p. 201).

Even in these brief extracts something of the poise and wisdom and far-reaching suggestiveness of this remarkable epitome can be detected.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

*Kultur, Ausbreitung, und Herkunft der Indogermanen.* Von SIGMUND FEIST. (Berlin: Weidmann. 1913. Pp. 573.)

EVERY few years comparative philology finds itself in the enviable position of being able to readjust its conception of the number, scope, and character of the Indo-European languages. This instability is not the least bit to be regretted, if for no other reason, because it is in the main the product of new and substantial archaeological discovery. Until comparatively recent times question was whether the Hittite (Chatti) were Indo-European or not. The late Hugo Winckler's famous excavation of the ancient capital of the Hittite empire, at Boghaz-Kiöi in Cappadocia, has ruled out for good and all the Hittite from the community of the Indo-European peoples. He found there Hittite inscriptions in cuneiform character, whereas Hittite was previously known only in undecipherable pictograph and cursive writing. Hittite is neither Indo-European nor Shemitic, but a native Asia Minor language (Anatolian), related, perhaps, to the Mitani language, situate in the northwest of Mesopotamia, and long known to scholars from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets.

Some years ago a premature attempt was made to classify three other languages as Indo-European, namely, the language of the Kassii, the Kossaeans (Κοσσαῖοι), or Kissians (Κίσσιοι) of the Greeks; the Mitani; and the Arzava, or Arzapi. Along with other scholars the writer of this review has expressed his disbelief as regards all three of these.<sup>1</sup> It may interest the reader to know that there are now, all told, nine languages in wedge character, only one of which, the so-called Old-Persian, or Achemenidan Persian (the native language of the Achemenidan dynasty, about 500–300 B. C.) is Indo-European. The list is: 1. Achemenidan, or Old Persian; 2. Elamite (Amardian, Neo-Susian), the second variety of Persian cuneiform; 3. Assyro-Babylonian; 4. Sumerian, or Sumero-Akkadian; 5. Kassite or Kossaeian; 6. Vannic, or Armenian cuneiform of Van; 7. Mitani; 8. Arzawian; 9. Hittite cuneiform.

On the other hand archaeological discoveries in Eastern or Chinese Turkestan, most of them recent,<sup>2</sup> have added to the stock of the Indo-European languages some rather important items. A Middle-Persian dialect, which is called Sogdian, was found as the vehicle of original Manichean religious literature, known previously only through the medium of Arabic writers and Christian Church Fathers. Next, the so-called "North-Aryan", found in the Khotan district in the southwest of Chinese Turkestan. This language is clearly of a somewhat more independent Aryan or Indo-Iranian character. There is some doubt as to its exact ethnological status, but I should say, all things considered, that it will in due time unmask itself as a remote and mixed Iranian dialect.<sup>3</sup>

Of yet greater interest is another Indo-European language, dug out of the sands of Turkestan, namely, the so-called Tocharian. This is a variety of Indo-European, neither Iranian nor Aryan, but in fact European, rather than Asiatic as might have been expected. The name Tocharian seems to be fairly warranted by a Turkish Buddhist fragment of the *Maitrisimit* (Maitreyasamiti) which professes to be translated from Hindu into "Tohri", and next from Tohri into Turkish. The Tocharians are known in Sanskrit literature as Tukhāra. Strabo, book XI., page 511, mentions the Τόχαροι as a nomad people inhabiting Bactria. The most striking feature of Tocharian is, as stated, its European character, or, more precisely, its clearly expressed character as a *centum* language. Historians may not be unacquainted with the fact that one of the most important isoglossic distinctions among the Indo-European languages is that between the *centum* and *satem* lan-

<sup>1</sup> "On some alleged Indo-European Languages in Cuneiform Character", *American Journal of Philology*, XXV. 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my review of Stein's *Ruins of Desert Cathay*, in this journal, XVIII. 113–116.

<sup>3</sup> This view I expressed for the first time, I believe, in the Johns Hopkins University *Circulars*, no. 210 (November, 1908). I see it seconded by A. Meille. in *Revue du Mois*, XIV. 149 (August, 1912).

guages, according as the word for "hundred" (and others like it) begins with a guttural stop *k*, or with a sibilant *s*. The *centum* languages are in the west and southwest of the Indo-European territory (Greek, Italic, Celtic, and Germanic); all the rest, with the exception of the Tocharian, are *satem* languages.

In some degree, I have no doubt, Feist was led on to the composition of his elaborate treatise by the advent of these new Indo-European materials. As is natural in the circumstances, he is disposed to appraise these at their full value, with a slight tendency towards overvaluation. Be this as it may, Feist's work is a learned, critical, up-to-date survey of the early linguistic history, ethnography, and civilization of the Indo-European peoples. It is the peer of the works of Schrader and Hirth in the same field, characterized, perhaps, by greater circumspectness than the works of either of these writers. In the matter of the statement of the intricate and many-sided problems involved in this essentially prehistoric study Feist's book is quite unexceptionable. His results are not, as a rule, as positive as theirs, a quality of self-repression which may fairly be counted unto him for righteousness.

I am not, for my part, delirious about the importance of the new Tocharian, as affecting the general question of the distribution and origin of the Indo-European languages. Feist seems to me to be influenced overmuch by the fascination of the new discovery, and the sensational quality of the Tocharian as a *centum* language. I do not think that the Tocharian should shake our faith in the reality of the *centum-satem* classification. The vast Indo-European habitat of historical times is divided faultlessly (if we leave out the Tocharian) into these two isoglottic sections. Feist's assumption of the gradual assimilation of *k* to *s* in the *satem* languages, in the manner of palatalization in the Romance languages, does not account for the regularity of the process, and the solidity of each of the two sections. Shortly after the first publications dealing with Tocharian three scholars (von Schroeder, Eduard Meyer, and myself<sup>4</sup>) noticed simultaneously that Tocharian shared certain characteristic instrumental endings with the Hittite of Boghaz-Kiöi. These it may have picked up on its way from Europe to Asia. The European quality of Tocharian points, in my opinion, to one conclusion, namely, that it is a stray European language which has found its way to that far-off Asiatic quarter, after taking up very many foreign elements on its long journey, a journey which was, doubtless, not performed in a single stage.

No less an historian than Eduard Meyer, in the first flush of the same discovery, thought that Tocharian proved the origin of the Indo-Europeans in Asia. I do not know whether this excellent scholar continues in this view. Feist elaborates it into what may be called a scientific theory, but I do not think that there is profit in the elaboration. Nearly fifty years ago (1868) Benfey pointed out that the investi-

<sup>4</sup> See my report in the Johns Hopkins University *Circular* cited above.

gations of geology (prehistoric archaeology) had shown that the great plain of Europe was from times immemorial the abode of man. In that plain no other than Indo-European speech was ever spoken; whereas the Indo-European languages in Asia are surrounded everywhere by allophyllic nations and languages. Indo-European in Asia obviously is (as in India or Armenia), or can easily be accounted for as, an over-crust. The non-Indo-European nationality of Asia Minor offers particularly good reason for assuming that these languages originated *somewhere in Europe*, and not *somewhere in Asia*, provided we include the Scythian steppes in the name Europe. If the spread of the Indo-Europeans had been from Asia to Europe the omission of Asia Minor is hardly explainable; the contrary movement from Continental Europe through Scythia into the Aryan (Indo-Iranian) region must naturally have passed around the water- and mountain-hedged peninsula of Asia Minor (see the maps). At a later time, a sea-faring time, Asia Minor began to be settled sporadically from Hellas and Thrace; then the Aegean Sea, Hellespont, Propontis, and Bosphorus, served as a bridge, rather than put apart, the two peninsulas of the Balkans and Asia Minor.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

*Scythians and Greeks: a Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus.* By ELLIS H. MINNS, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College. (Cambridge: University Press. 1913. Pp. xl, 720, with illustrations.)

NEARLY sixty years ago, Neumann published the first volume of his book *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*—and died. Mr. Minns has been more fortunate; for, *πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν*, he has attempted a history of Scythia, and lived to publish the whole. Now, having caught up these prodigious arrears (in essentials, if not in every detail), he will find it recreation to keep abreast of what the Russians write, and tell us at intervals what there is fresh to know. For this is a monumental book. The preliminary bibliography of Russian *serial* publications alone occupies four pages. As Mr. Minns says in his preface, he has attempted to begin at the beginning; so there is an admirable sketch of the physical geography of the region in chapter I., and a full summary in chapter VII. of its "pre-Scythic" culture, little known as yet, but very remarkable in its late neolithic and early bronze-age phases, with finely decorated pottery, painted with spirals and leaf-like designs which suggest affinities with Cucuteni and other Rumanian sites, and more remotely with one phase of neolithic Thessaly. Russian archaeologists may well be excused for thinking, in a first enthusiasm, that they had here the origin of the curvilinear painted ceramic of the Aegean: but there does not seem to be any evidence of such a connection.

But if this culture is "pre-Scythian", who were the Scythians?